



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD  
KIVA - CITY HALL  
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD  
SEPTEMBER 7, 2006  
**APPROVED** STUDY SESSION MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Ron McCullagh, Councilman  
Jeremy A. Jones, Vice Chairman  
David Barnett, Commissioner  
Michael Edwards, Design Member  
Michael D'Andrea, Development Member  
David Brantner, Development Member  
Michael Schmitt, Design Member

**STAFF:** Kim Chafin  
Tim Curtis  
Hank Epstein  
Lusia Galav  
Louisa Garbo  
Frank Gray  
Don Hadder  
Jeff Ruenger  
Sherry Scott  
Dan Symer

**CALL TO ORDER**

The study session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilwoman Drake at 12:21 p.m.

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Galav introduced two new members of the senior planning staff, Louisa Garbo and Hank Epstein.

1. **REVIEW DRB CASES**

Ms. Galav noted that DRB concerns had been addressed in 17-DR-2006 and staff would be comfortable moving the case to the consent agenda.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

3. 105-DR-2004#2 Scottsdale Air Center - Hangar 5

Ms. Galav clarified that the application was for an addition to an aircraft hanger area that has already been master planned.

In response to an inquiry by Vice-Chairman Jones, Mr. Ruenger explained that the Regal Mist Deer grass was used in the previous approval. Vice-Chairman Jones noted the reason for his concern was because of the possibility of hazard due to exposure to flammable liquids etcetera. Mr. Ruenger confirmed that staff was comfortable with the use.

4. 26-PP-2005 Buffalo Ranch

Ms. Galav reviewed the plat which was 23 lots on 7.5 acres.

In response to a request by Commissioner Barnett, Mr. Curtis reviewed the locations of homeowners who had requested that additional one-story stipulations be included. Mr. Curtis explained that during the rezoning lots seven and eight were restricted to one story. Since that time several homeowners have requested that the south row of lots be included in that stipulation.

5. 5-PP-2006 DC Ranch Parcel 2.15 Preliminary Plat

Ms. Galav noted the request was for a preliminary plat approval for 34 lots on 10 acres as part of the DC Ranch development.

In response to a question by Vice-Chairman Jones regarding the design of the walls in narrow passages parallel to each other, Mr. Curtis explained that security was not the primary concern. He confirmed that the wall design was meant to allow a little natural desert to come between the walls.

6. 6-PP-2006 Parcel M and O at Troon

Ms. Galav reviewed the request for a preliminary plat for 34 lots on 10 acres in the Troon development.

Vice-Chairman Jones clarified that this case was stipulated to return for color approval at a later date.

In response to a question by Board Member D'Andrea, Mr. Curtis confirmed that there were no stipulations regarding flight paths because the property was not in the vicinity of the airport.

7. 53-DR-1994#2 Hotel Indigo

Ms. Galav noted this was an approval for exterior renovations.

In response to an inquiry by Vice-Chairman Jones, Mr. Hecht explained that the color choices were made by the ownership; they wanted a fresh, distinct look, keeping in mind that these buildings are visible above other surrounding

buildings from Camelback Road. Vice-Chairman Jones approved of the color choice, but expressed concern that using a single color would not be consistent and compatible with the sculptural elements.

Board Member D'Andrea expressed a dislike for the use of the dark color on the pop-out areas of the face of the building; he suggested investigating different applications for the color. Use of a lighter color in the pool area would provide more reflectivity and better light quality.

It was the consensus of the Board to move the item to the regular agenda for additional discussion on the color.

### **REGULAR AGENDA**

8.        17-DR-2006                                68th Street and Thomas Road

Ms. Galav reiterated the fact that staff would be comfortable moving the item to the consent agenda.

In response to a question by Board Member Schmitt, Mr. Symer confirmed that the trees along the west side of the property would be replaced as part of the project.

In response to concern by Board Member Edwards, Mr. Ross agreed that two feet of landscaping could be added to the parking areas along the west side in order to provide some solar relief.

In response to comments by Board Member D'Andrea, Mr. Ross agreed to lower the overhangs on both the west and east elevations in order to provide better shading of the windows.

Councilman McCullagh suggested pulling the sidewalks away from the street along Thomas and 68th Street and meandering them a little bit. Mr. Ross noted that a bus stop was located adjacent to that area and he felt landscaping and a maximum setback for the building were important. Councilman McCullagh clarified that he was suggesting repositioning in order to pull it away from the street which would make it more pedestrian friendly.

Vice-Chairman Jones commented that the Applicant had taken many Board suggestions and made much progress. He inquired about other Board Members' views on making a stipulation to move the curb on the side of the building four feet to the west in order to allow for planter shade, lowering the recessed roofs to the same height as the glass or lower, and moving the sidewalk far enough from the corner of 68th and Thomas to add planters and allowing the case to move to the consent agenda.

Board Member D'Andrea suggested widening the sidewalk and using tree grates instead of planters as an alternate.

**1. 94-DR-2005 Windgate Crossing**

Mr. Curtis presented the Board with an accurate reflection of the color elevations and a sample of the color block which had been requested upon approval of the case on June 15, 2006. He noted that the white marquee sign had been removed and an elevation depicting suggested pedestrian access as well as a narrative explaining all of the changes was included in the packet. Staff opined that the Applicant had satisfied the concerns expressed by the Board.

In response to an inquiry by Board Member D'Andrea, Todd Lawrence from Butler Design Group clarified that the pneumatic tube depicted in the elevations was incorrect. The bank has decided to use an underground system; construction drawings have been submitted that reflect the underground system.

Vice-Chairman Jones confirmed that the Board was satisfied with the changes and agreed that staff could do the final approvals.

**Study session recessed at 1:05 p.m. to commence the regular meeting and continued at 1:37 p.m.**

**2. 69-DR-2006 Grand Lux Cafe**

Ms. Chafin reviewed the Grand Lux Café's proposal to locate on the south elevation of Scottsdale Fashion Square facing Camelback Road. She noted that several locations exist throughout the country, the closest in Los Vegas. Ms. Chafin presented the materials board and explained the purpose of the study session was to review the baroque style architecture the Applicant was proposing.

Mr. Scott Duffner from Fancher Development addressed the Board. Highlights of his presentation included a perspective and elevations depicting the massing and the general design intent. He confirmed that the Grand Lux Café was affiliated with the Cheesecake Factory.

Board Member D'Andrea asked how the function of the restaurant influenced the architecture and how the Applicant saw it fitting into the area. Mr. John Berdict explained that the intent was to create something that would be unique and compatible with the surrounding tenants. Mr. Gray noted staff assumed that the architectural style was Egyptian Renaissance; nothing similar exists in the area.

Vice-Chairman Jones described the architecture as fake, resembling something out of Hollywood. Vice-Chairman Jones suggested the context of the shopping center needed to be defined: Would a series of interesting incompatible façades or a subdued compatible context be more appropriate? He opined that the "big box" style of the shopping center was not interesting and this design was fun. He would find it hard to direct the Applicant to a common element to make it consistent.

Board Member Schmitt agreed that the design would add some interest to an otherwise bland, harsh area. In response to a question by Board Member Schmitt, Mr. Duffner clarified there was no intent to tie the project into the

Waterfront or Fashion Square, other than from a massing standpoint; it will become a center point of attraction.

Board Member Schmitt's personal preference would be to see a classier approach instead of an over-the-top Vegas approach. He referenced the Sapporo Restaurant recently approved and the way they themed their restaurant while remaining classy. Board Member Schmitt noted that he would support the general concept.

Commissioner Barnett reiterated Board Member Schmitt's comments regarding Sapporo Restaurant, noting the City's desire for architecture that is "uniquely Scottsdale". Commissioner Barnett expressed a dislike for the design.

Board Member Brantner opined that if the surrounding buildings had more pizzazz, that would tone down the design. He commented that when the Cheesecake Factory was put in at the Biltmore Fashion Square it enlivened the area, which accomplished their goal.

Board Member Edwards agreed with Board Member Schmitt's comments that the design would be acceptable with more refinement.

Ms. Galav confirmed that there are no applications being processed at this time for additional remodels in Fashion Square. Mr. Gray noted that Westcor had expressed an interest in renovating the entire center over the next couple of years.

Board Member D'Andrea expressed a concern about what kind of precedents would be set by allowing theme restaurants to be built on land currently used for loading and Dumpsters in order to maximize square footage.

Vice-Chairman Jones noted the project contained colors that were rich, interesting, and compatible, and provided quality design. Reconsidering the yellow and taking it to a creamy beige would bring the Board closer to accepting the design; the yellow combined with the other colors created too much vibrancy.

Mr. Berdict presented a color board which depicted the yellow color together with an optional version of the color. He clarified that the blue design on the building was applied stencil; tiles are applied below the windows or are granite. Vice-Chairman Jones commented that the stencil application was not compatible with the design; if the design were simplified by removing one or two treatments and the colors were toned down, it would bring the project together.

In response to an inquiry by Councilman McCullagh, Mr. Berdict confirmed that Westcor had approved the design.

3. 7-ZN-2006 Lone Mountain Bank

Mr. Hadder explained that this presentation was the first to come through under the new process allowing the Development Review Board to provide comments on site plans for zoning cases prior to them going through Planning Commission

or City Council. Mr. Hadder reviewed the parcel location and the context of the area.

Mr. Gray clarified the policy change was made in response to problems encountered during DRB hearings when sites are rezoned to specific site plans. The policy is that no rezoning to a specific site plan will go to the Planning Commission or the City Council that will require subsequent Development Review Board approval without the DRB having made preliminary comments.

In response to a question by Vice-Chairman Jones regarding the walkway and a front door, Mr. Hadder explained the submitted elevations were hypothetical, a five or six foot setback depicted where the walkway would be located. Vice-Chairman Jones commented that he saw no alternative location for the drive-through and expressed concern about vehicle backup on Scottsdale Road.

Ms. Galav confirmed the site plan would return for a formal Development Review Board approval. Board Member comments will be forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council as part of their packets with the case.

In response to a remark by Board Member Edwards, Mr. Hadder noted that the application asked for relief from the standard 100 foot scenic corridor setback. Board Member Edwards inquired whether the passby lane could be done away with in order to reduce encroachment on the scenic corridor. Mr. Rief stated that they could consider having one drive-through lane and keeping the passby lane.

In response to a question by Commissioner Barnett regarding contradictions between the Planning Commission, City Council, and Development Review, Mr. Gray explained that the Planning Commission and City Council can choose not to take the advice of the Development Review Board; the Development review Board would move forward with its review of the architecture knowing they made their advice known. Staff discourages applicants stipulating to specific site plans as much as possible, however in cases where rezoning may be inappropriate, stipulating to a site plan may influence the decision.

Mr. Gray noted that a planned unit development ordinance was being developed which would have its own design guidelines for each development that comes through. Theoretically the system currently being utilized will no longer be used.

In response to a question by Board Member D'Andrea, Mr. Hadder explained that both Scottsdale Road and Lone Mountain Road were interim improvements; the anticipated construction on Scottsdale Road would be a four-lane roadway which would have either six or eight foot sidewalks. Scottsdale road is included in the Prop 400 schedule and is approximately 15 years from beginning; no CAP projects are scheduled for Lone Mountain. With regard to access points, the lesser of two evils would be Lone Mountain Road because there would be no opportunity for left turns off of Scottsdale Road. Mr. Hadder explained that on Scottsdale Road the preference is not to have intersections and driveways closer together than 660 feet; on Lone Mountain Road the minimum distance is 330 feet. A joint driveway with the because the neighboring property is not an option, because that is a single-family lot.

In response to a question by Board Member Schmitt regarding allowances for an 80 foot scenic corridor in a 100 foot scenic corridor, Mr. Hadder explained the policy approved by the Development Review Board is for 100 feet, it is a policy so there is room for reconsideration for various site plans based on context. This case is rezoning for a non residential use which is 100 feet. Mr. Hadder stated that occasionally reduction requests are granted for drainage structures and retention basins, but that staff preference is not to intrude on scenic corridor.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT**

Ms. Galav noted there were no staff approvals.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, Councilman McCullagh moved for adjournment at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
AV-Tronics, Inc.